DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 826 SE 040 185

AUTHOR	Herbert, Martin; Small, Ava
TITLE	Teacher Questionnaire Data. Third Grade. Evaluation Report 4-C-1. Extended Pilot Trial of the Comprehensive School Mathematics Program.
INSTITUTION	CEMREL, Inc., St. Louis, Mo.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Nov 77
NOTE	59p.; For related documents, see SE 040 181-196 and SE 040 340-348.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Research; *Elementary School Mathematics; Elementary School Teachers; *Grade 3; Interviews; *Mathematics Curriculum; Mathematics Instruction; Primary Education; Questionnaires; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*Comprehensive School Mathematics Program; *Mathematics Education Research

ABSTRACT

The Comprehensive School Mathematics Program (CSMP) is a program of CEMREL, Inc., one of the national educational laboratories, and was funded by the National Institute of Education (NIE). Its major purpose is the development of curriculum materials for the elementary grades. Beginning in 1973, CSMP ran an extended pilot trial of its elementary program. This material looks at responses to a questionnaire by all 69 third-grade teachers of CSMP in May 1977. Further, the document summarizes the responses by 32 of the teachers to interviews. Results showed a definitely favorable attitude towards CSMP on the part of the teachers, but the responses were less favorable than from the previous year's third-grade teachers. Further, responses were also less favorable than in previous grade levels, and new-to-CSMP teachers responded less favorably than veterans of CSMP did. Also, there were many indications that teachers saw more need for emphasis on basic skills. (MP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EXTENDED PILOT TRIALS OF THE COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL MATHEMATICS PROGRAM:

EVALUATION REPORT SERIES

ED225826

Evaluation Report 4-C-1
Teacher Questionnaire Data
Third Grade

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CEMREL INC.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SE040185

Extended Pilot Trial of the Comprehensive School Mathematics Program

Evaluation Report 4-C-1

Teacher Questionnaire Data

Third Grade

Martin Herbert

Ava Small

November, 1977

Developed by CEMREL, Inc., a private nonprofit corporation supported in part as an educational laboratory by funds from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

Copyright on these materials is claimed only during the period of development, test, and evaluation, unless additional authorization is granted by the National Institute of Education, to claim copyright on the final materials. For information on the status of the copyright claim, contact either the copyright proprietor or the National Institute of Education.

Description of Evaluation Report Series

The Comprehensive School Mathematics Program (CSMP) is a program of CEMREL, Inc., one of the national educational laboratories, and is funded by the National Institute of Education. Its major purpose is the development of curriculum materials for grades K-6.

Beginning in September, 1973, CSMP began an extended pilot trial of its Elementary Program. The pilot trial is longitudinal in nature; students who began using CSMP materials in kindergarten or first grade in 1973-74, were able to use them in first and second grades respectively in 1974-75, and so on in subsequent years. Hence the adjective "extended".

The evaluation of the program in this extended pilot trial is intended to be reasonably comprehensive and to supply information desired by a wide variety of audiences. For that reason the reports in this series are reasonably non-technical and do not attempt to widely explore some of the related research issues. The list of reports from the first two years of the extended pilot trial is given on the next page. The most comprehensive of these are the following:

1-A-1: Overview, Design and Instrumentation
1-A-3: Final Summary Report, Year 1
2-A-1: Final Summary Report, Year 2
3-B-1: Summary of Second and Third Grade Test Data Year 3
4-A-1: Final Summary Report, Year 4
and 4-A-2: Summary of Grades K-3 Evaluation

Evaluation Report Series

Evaluation Report 1-A-1	Overview, Design and Instrumentation
Evaluation Report 1-A-2	External Review of CSMP Materials
Evaluation Report 1-A-3	Final Summary Report Year 1
Evaluation Report 1-B-1	Mid-Year Test Data: CSMP First Grade Content
Evaluation Report 1-B-2	End-of-Year Test Data: CSMP First Grade Content
Evaluation Report 1-B-3	End-of-Year Test Data: Standard First Grade Content
Evaluation Report 1-B-4	End-of Year Test Data: CSMP Kindergarten Content
Evaluation Report 1-B-5	Test Data on Some General Cognitive Skills
Evaluation Report 1-B-6	Summary Test Data: Detroit Schools
Evaluation Report 1-C-1	Teacher Training Report
Evaluation Report 1-C-2	Observations of CSMP First Grade Classes
Evaluation Report 1-C-3	Mid-Year Data from Teacher Questionnaires
Evaluation Report 1-C-4	End-of-Year Data from Teacher Questionnaires
Evaluation Report 1-C-5	Interviews with CSMP Kindergarten Teachers
Evaluation Report 1-C-6	Analysis of Teacher Logs
Evaluation Report 2-A-1	Final Summary Report Year 2
Evaluation Report 2-B-1	Second Grade Test Data
Evaluation Report 2-B-2	Readministration of First Grade Test Items
Evaluation Report 2-B-3	Student Interviews
Evaluation Report 2-C-1	Teacher Questionnaire Data
Evaluation Report 2-C-2	Teacher Interviews, Second Grade
Evaluation Report 2-C-3	Teacher Interviews, First Grade
Evaluation Report 3-B-1	Second and Third Grade Test Data Year 3
Evaluation Report 3-C-1	Teacher Questionnaire Data Year 3
Evaluation Report 4-A-1	Final Summary Report Year 4
Evaluation Report 4-A-2	Summary of Grades K-3 Evaluation
Evaluation Report 4-B-1	Standardized Test Data, Third Grade
Evaluation Report 4-B-2	Mathematics Applied to Novel Situations (MANS) Test Data
Evaluation Report 4-B-3	Individually Administered Problems, Third Grade
Evaluation Report 4-C-1	Teacher Questionnaire Data, Third Grade

Key to Indexing

1-C-2 Observations of CSMP First Grade Classes

"2" refers simply to the number within a given year and type of data

"C" refers to the type of data being reported
- A: Overview, summary and theoretical reports
- B: Student outcomes
- C: Non-test data

"1" refers to the year of the Pilot Study according to the following:

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade	. . .
Year 1 (1973-74)	▨	▨			
Year 2 (1974-75)		▨	▨		
Year 3 (1975-76)			▨	▨	

.
.
.

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Teacher Questionnaire

- Description 2
- Rate of Return 2
- Description of Teachers 3
- Results by Type of Question 3
- Results by CSMP Experiences of Teacher/Class. . . . 8
- Results Compared to Previous Years 9
- Low Ability Discrepancy 11

Teacher Interviews 12

Summary 15

Appendices

- A: Teacher Questionnaire 17
- B: Responses About Particular Lessons 25
- C: Responses to Open Ended Questionnaire Items . . 27
- D: Responses to Questions Unique to the Interview . 43

Introduction

In the fall of 1973, the Comprehensive School Mathematics Program (CSMP) began a longitudinal pilot study of its Elementary School Program. Over 100 teachers began using the program, either in first grade or kindergarten. During the 1974-75 and 1975-76 school years (the second and third years of the pilot study) some of these classes continued with CSMP materials in the next grade levels, and many new classes began using CSMP materials. The 1976-77 school year constituted the fourth year of this pilot study, with some of the original classes continuing with CSMP in third and fourth grades. Once again, many new classes began using CSMP at grade levels K through 4.

In May, 1977, a questionnaire was sent to all third grade teachers of CSMP (69 in all). In addition to the questionnaires, interviews were conducted with 32 of the 69 teachers at the three sites where end-of-the-year testing was conducted (Missouri, Georgia and Maine). This report summarizes the responses by these third grade teachers to interview and questionnaire items.

Teacher Questionnaire

Description of the Questionnaire

The items in the questionnaire dealt with two main issues: the implementation of the program and the teacher's experience with, and evaluation of, the program.

The implementation issue covered such things as the extent of and variation in, the usage of CSMP materials, the extent and content of supplementary materials used, the effectiveness of training received, etc.

The experience and evaluation issue covered the extent of agreement with CSMP's emphasis on the separate topics, experience with specific lessons and specific aspects of the program, degree to which the program was geared to the perceived mathematical needs and abilities of the students, comparison (on several dimensions) of CSMP and more conventional programs, evaluation of the spiral approach, positive and negative aspects of the program, overall evaluation of the program, etc.

Two separate questionnaires were distributed: a complete, six-page version sent to the 37 teachers not interviewed (see Appendix A), and a shortened, three-page version sent to the 32 who were. Where appropriate, responses to interview items have been combined with responses to corresponding questionnaire questions.

Rate of Return of the Questionnaire

Of the 69 questionnaires distributed to all the sites using CSMP at the third grade level, 41 were returned. This is a 59% rate of return, which can be compared to a 46% rate in 1976, and a 53% rate in 1975, and a 58% rate in 1974. Altogether 50 teachers either returned the questionnaire, or were interviewed, or both.

In examining the return rate on questionnaires, it is important to determine as well as possible whether any significant differences exist between the teachers who did and did not return the questionnaire. In an attempt to do this, an informal study was done. Each of the 32 teachers who was interviewed was classified by the interviewer according to attitude toward CSMP as "favorable", "mixed", or "unfavorable". The table below shows this classification and how many teachers within each category did or did not return the questionnaire. This table provides no clear evidence that the rate of return was much affected by teacher attitude toward CSMP.

Table 1

Interviewer's Judgement of Teacher's Attitude

Returned Questionnaire?	Favorable	Mixed	Unfavorable
No	2	3	2
Yes	11	10	4

Description of the Teachers and Classes

Each teacher and each class was assigned to one of two categories: experperienced with CSMP or inexperienced with CSMP. If a teacher had had one or more years' experience with CSMP, he/she was called "experienced". The class was experienced if most of the students had CSMP the previous year. The following table shows the numbers of teacher/classes in each possible category.

Table 2

Teacher Class Experience

Classes	Teachers		
	Experienced	Inexperienced	Total
Experienced	22	26	48
Inexperienced	1	20	21
Total	23	46	69

Except for the single experienced teacher with inexperienced class(an unlikely pairing given the nature of the implementation of the CSMP program), the distribution of teacher/classes among the other three possible categories is quite ever. The rates of return of questionnaires were similar (between 50%-68%) for these three categories.

Results by Type of Questions

For all items, the circled entries are percentages of teachers responding in the indicated manner.

a) Implementation and Experience with Particular Lessons:

Because these questions were rather formative in nature and specific to individual lessons, they are not given here. See Appendix B for the questions and responses.

b) Experience with General Features of CSMP

Do the workbooks tell you enough for you to make evaluations of the students' progress?

Yes: (26) *Yes & No:* (26) *No:* (49)

Should tests be built into the materials at certain places?

Yes: (62) *Yes for parents and administrators:* (9) *Yes, for students:* (7)

No: (19) *Uncertain:* (2)

What week of the CSMP schedule were you on, or do you expect to be on, at the end of the school year?

84% indicated they expected to finish the scheduled lessons.

Have you followed the schedule fairly closely? ____

Fairly closely: (56) or *Somewhat:* (28) *No:* (15)

If not, what changes did you make? _____

Changes in spiral approach: (13) *Skipped certain types of lessons:* (17)

Added supplementary material: (42) *Other:* (29)

Do you find that CSMP required more or less time in teacher led work with the whole class than other math programs you have used?

More: (80) *Same:* (17) *Less:* (2)

Do you like this aspect of CSMP?

Yes: (44) *No:* (34) *Yes & No:* (17) *Uncertain:* (5)

Do you feel you were fairly well prepared for teaching CSMP after your initial training? (If not please indicate what you thought was lacking.)

Yes: (61) *Somewhat:* (17) *No:* (26)

Compared to previous mathematics programs you have used, how does CSMP compare on the following items:

Time required for daily preparation is

(3) (less) (11) (about the same) (53) (more at first but about the same after a year's experience) (24) (more at first and continues to be after a year's experience)

The amount of time given to math instruction with CSMP is

(57) (greater) (35) (about the same) (8) (less)

(68) (26) *(uncertain:* (6)

(Is this a positive or negative feature of CSMP?_____)

If you occasionally used supplemental materials (drill sheets, etc.), answer item a). (57)

If you used CSMP in combination with some other math program or text, answer item b). (43)

a) What kinds of supplementary materials did you use? _____

Teacher-made materials: (93) *Other dittos:* (7)

Covering what topics? *Basic skills:* (66)

Basic skills plus other (measurement, etc): (32)

How often did you use these materials? *Everyday:* (34) *2-4 times/week:* (43)

once a week: (9) *Twice/month:* (6) *Less than once/month:* (9)

b) Name of other math program or text? *Addison-Wesley:* (14) *SRA:* (10) *Other:* (57) *Houghton-Mifflin:* (14) *Ginn:* (5)

During what part of the school year? *Throughout:* (58) *Middle:* (21) *End:* (16)

Roughly what proportion of time did the class spend on this program as opposed to CSMP?

The majority wrote 20-30%

For which of the following strands did you think there were too many lessons in the Guide? Too few lessons?

	Too Many	Too Few	About Right
World of Numbers	☐ (0)	☐ (28)	☐ (72)
Language of Strings	☐ (11)	☐ (6)	☐ (83)
Language of Arrows	☐ (12)	☐ (2)	☐ (85)
Geometry & Measurement	☐ (8)	☐ (46)	☐ (46)
Probability, Statistics & Combinatorics	☐ (46)	☐ (10)	☐ (44)

c) Perception of Student Achievement

Were there any skills that your students lacked at the beginning of the year that the third grade CSMP curriculum seemed to expect of them?

No: (39)	*Minicomputer skills:* (12)	*Arrow diagrams:* (7)
	Subtraction: (10)	*Division:* (7)
	Multiplication: (10)	*Other:* (17)

Are there any skills that your CSMP students don't have now that you think most third graders should have?

No: (34)	*Basic Skills* (58)	*Geometry:* (7)

Compared to previous mathematics programs you have used, how does CSMP compare on the following items:

Students' overall achievement of the usual math skills and concepts with CSMP is

(14) (far less) (14) (a little less) (37) (about the same) (26) (a little more) (9) (far more)

Students' ability to do logical reasoning with CSMP is

(5) (far less) (11) (a little less) (8) (about the same) (58) (a little more) (18) (far more)

Students' facility in solving word problems with CSMP is

(19) (far less) (14) (a little less) (41) (about the same) (22) (a little more) (5) (far more)

d) General Experience and Evaluation
(An asterisk indicates that the complete set of responses is given in full in Appendix C)

Compared to previous mathematics programs you have used, how does CSMP compare on the following items:

Student interest and involvement with CSMP is

(5) (far less) (16) (a little less) (16) (about the same) (37) (a little more) (32) (far more)

Overall quality of CSMP is

(11) (much lower) (6) (slightly lower) (25) (about the same) (44) (slightly higher) (19) (much higher)

The appropriateness of CSMP for low ability students is

(34) (much lower) (29) (slightly lower) (23) (about the same) (9) (slightly higher) (6) (much higher)

* What do you think are the best aspects of CSMP?

Allows children to think and be creative; interests students; challenging; promotes logical thinking; provides variety; like spiral approach

* What do you think are the worst aspects of CSMP?

Not enough drill on basic facts; too difficult for slow students; too much teacher preparation and time; need for evaluative material; too much material

* What is your overall evaluation of CSMP?

Positive: (35) *Positive with reservations:* (51) *Negative:* (14)

* Does the spiral approach, as exemplified by the different strands, seem to be working for your children?

Yes: (44) *Yes & No:* (32) *No:* (23)

Results by CSMP Experience of Teacher/Class

For most of the above questions, either the results are so similar across teacher/class categories that it is pointless to reproduce them here, or the questions are such that an average score is meaningless. However, on 10 items, average scores are possible and the results across teacher/class categories are not uniform.

For eight of the items (given below), teachers of classes without previous CSMP experience gave rather different responses than did teachers whose classes did have previous CSMP experience. In italics below each item, a phrase describes the responses of teachers of inexperienced classes, relative to the responses of the other teachers.

Compared to previous mathematics programs you have used:
Student interest and involvement with CSMP...
Students' overall achievement of the usual math skills and concepts with CSMP...
Students' ability to do logical reasoning with CSMP is...
Overall quality of CSMP is...
What is your overall evaluation of CSMP? (free response)
(lower rating on all of the above)

Time required for daily preparation is...
Amount of time given to math instruction is...
(more preparation time but less time for math instruction)

Have you followed the schedule closely?
(more closely)

In general then, where the class was new-to-CSMP, the teacher tended to give a a lower evaluation of the program.

Results Compared to Previous Years

Four evaluative questions have been asked of CSMP teachers during each year of the Extended Pilot Test. These are given below together with mean scores. In each question the teacher was asked to compare CSMP with previously used math programs. The responses were coded from 1-5 with 1 for "far less" (or "far lower"), 3 for "about the same", and 5 for "far more" (or "far higher").

Table 3
Mean Scores by Grade/Year
for Repeated Questionnaire Items

Grade Level	K		1		2		3	
Year of EPT	1	2	1	2	2	3	3	4
(N)	(30)	(60)	(35)	(75)	(23)	(32)	(18)	(38)
Student Interest and Involvement	4.6	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.3	4.4	3.7
Student Overall Achievement	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.5	3.8	3.7	3.0
Appropriateness for low ability Students	3.2	2.9	2.7	2.6	2.7	3.0	3.2	2.3
Overall quality	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.8	4.3	4.4	3.6

It should be noted that the third item was changed from "students' overall achievement" in the first two years of the EPT to "students' overall achievement in the usual skills and concepts" in the third and fourth years. This may account for the decline in the mean score from second to third year. Apart from this the results are remarkably consistent a) from grade to grade and b) within grades from first to second questionnaire administration, until this year's third grade responses. These are uniformly lower (less favorable to CSMP) on each item and this result is true regardless of teacher/class experience.

Several other questions have been asked previously of second and third grade teachers and these are summarized below.

Word Problems:

Using the same coding system as described above for comparing CSMP students' facility with word problems with previous math programs, the mean scores for second and third grade teachers last year were 3.2 and 3.9 respectively, and for third grade teachers this year was 2.8. That means a drop of about one unit and overall slightly more negative than positive responses for this year's third grade teachers.

Logical Reasoning:

The mean scores in evaluating students' ability to do logical reasoning were 4.2 and 4.0 last year versus 3.7 this year; a small decrease but still very positive response overall.

Teacher Preparation Time:

The most frequent response to this question has always been that more time is required the first year with CSMP but not after that, and this response was even more dominant this year.

Supplementary Materials:

The percent of teachers using supplementary materials on a regular basis (at least once a week) was 62 and 85 last year for second and third grade teachers respectively, and 85 for third grade teachers this year.

Need for Evaluation Materials:

The percent of teachers who thought student evaluation materials should be included in CSMP materials was 68 and 94 last year, and 79 this year.

Spiral Approach:

In an open-ended evaluation of the spiral approach, 65% of the teachers last year gave definitely positive responses and 16% definitely negative (with little difference between second and third grade) while this year 44% gave positive and 23% negative responses.

Overall Evaluation:

Last year 90% of the responses were <u>generally</u> positive towards CSMP, with about 1/3 of those responses indicating reservations of one kind or another about the program. This year 86% of the responses were generally positive, and nearly 2/3 expressed some reservations.

The Low Ability Student Discrepancy

There is one finding from the questionnaire throughout the EPT that is very curious, especially when it is compared with the appropriate data. Every year, teachers give a much less positive rating to CSMP in regard to its appropriateness to low ability student than in any other regard (see Tabel 3)). At the same time end-of-year achievement tests show that low ability CSMP students generally do as well as, or better than, low ability Non-CSMP students.

In order to shed more light on this discrepancy, it seemed prudent to look more closely at the teachers who were less positive in judging CSMP's appropriateness with low ability students. To do this, mean scores were calculated for:

a) test scores on all tests administered as part of CSMP-Non-CSMP comparisons,

b) various groups of items from interview/questionnaires which yielded scores on amount of supplementing, emphasis on mental arithmetic, emphasis about various aspects of CSMP, etc.

Correlations between all of the above were computed. Out of 10 variables developed from the interview/questionnaire, only one yielded significant and consistent correlations with test scores. This was "teacher judgment about CSMP appropriateness for low ability students" and it had negative correlations with class scores from problem-oriented tests (both pre and post) and with teachers' estimate of their students problem solving ability.

Upon further analysis of this data, it was discovered that of the 21 responding teachers of classes where test data has been collected, 5 rated CSMP as "far less" appropriate for low ability students. Among these 5 were the 4 four highest ability classes in the whole study, containing an average of less than 5% low ability students. Because there were so few students, it was not feasible to find out whether or not the achievement by these low ability students in high ability classes was less than would be expected. Hence these teachers' judgments may have been based on either a) their own low ability students (one or two per class) or b) their assumptions of what would happen with many low ability students in a class.

There was no difference between the responses to this question by teachers of other ability level classes. Teachers of low ability classes gave about the same overall rating as did teachers of average ability classes. It is also true that, unlike most of the other judgmental questionnaire items, there was no difference in the responses to this question due to the teacher or class being experienced with CSMP.

Teacher Interviews

During May of 1977, each of the three members of the evaluation staff visited one of three sites (Missouri, Georgia and Maine) where they observed each of the third grade CSMP teachers (if possible), and conducted a taped interview with the teacher lasting 20 to 45 minutes.

The questions in the interview are given below. Many of the questions were also asked in one form or another in the "long form" questionnaire (sent to the non-interviewed teachers). The responses to these questions were combined with the responses to the corresponding questionnaire items and this data has already been presented as part of the section on questionnaire data. (The page numbers where this data can be found are given in parentheses.)

Responses to the interview questions not combined with the questionnaire data are summarized below. Appendix D gives the complete set of responses to each of these questions.

A. Reaction to the Schedule of Lessons

(A-1) How do you feel todays's lesson went? This question was only asked if the interviewer was present during the lesson, which was about a third of the time. It was the first question in the interview and has always been a good "ice breaker" in talking with teachers. Most of the teachers felt the lesson had gone well.

(A-2) Which lesson is it on the schedule? The interviews were conducted during April and May. Thus there was some variation in how many of the 35 weeks in the schedule one might expect the teachers to have completed. All teachers were at least to Week 22 of the schedule.

(A-3) Have you followed the schedule fairly closely or have you made some changes in it for your class? (See Page 4)

(A-4) Would you like to see the schedule revised? How so? Responses were recorded for 28 of the 32 teachers interviewed. Nine (32%) said "No", while nineteen (68%) said "Yes". From those nineteen teachers came the following eight suggestions for changes, with parentheses around the number of teachers making that suggestion.

Not really happy with the spiral aspect (6)
Found it hard to use (better to have a day-by-day schedule) (3)
Lessons are too long (3)
Would prefer declared lesson objectives (2)
Would like to see subtraction earlier in the schedule (2)
More traditional material, less non-traditional material (1)
No need for free days (1)
Too many lessons on the same topic (1)

B. Teacher Preparation

(B-1) Do you feel you were fairly well prepared for teaching CSMP after your training? (See page 4)

(B-2) Do you periodically get together with your coordinator or with other teachers during the year? Is this helpful? Nineteen of the thirty-two teachers answered this question. The predominant response was "met with the coordinator seldom and it was somewhat helpful, met with other teachers (informally) often and it was very helpful".

(B-3) Do you think most third grade teachers could do an adequate job of teaching CSMP? Only two of the twenty-eight respondents answered in the negative. Most of the twenty-six positive responses were mildly qualified, for example: "with a little more training", "the second time around", "with hard work".

C. Spiral Approach

(C-1) Does the spiral approach seem to be working for your children? (See Page 7 and Appendix C)

D. Supplementary Materials

(D-1) Do you feel it is necessary to supplement CSMP with other kinds of materials? (See Page 5)

What kinds of materials? (form and content) How often? (See page 5)

E. Skill Deficiencies

(E-1) Were there any skills that your students lacked at the beginning of the year that the CSMP curriculum seemed to expect of them? (See Page 6)

(E-2) Are there any skills that your CSMP students don't have now that you think most third graders should have? (See Page 6)

F. Workbooks

(F-1) How do you assign workbooks to students? (See Appendix B)

(F-2) How much time do you usually give for each workbook series or for each story book? From the 21 responses to this question, it is fair to say that in general it appears that the workbooks and story books are being used about as intended.

(F-3) Do the workbooks tell you enough for you to make evaluations of the student's progress? Should there be tests built into the materials at certain places? (See Page 3)

G. Teacher-led Time

(G-1) Do you find that CSMP requires more or less time in teacher-led work with the whole class? (See page 4)
Do you like that aspect of CSMP? (See page 4)

H. Perceptions

(H-1) Have your perceptions of CSMP changed since the beginning of the year? Of the 26 responses to this question, 13 could be classified as showing a more favorable attitude to CSMP than at the beginning of the year, 5 as showing a less favorable attitude and 8 as indicating neither.

(H-2) What's your overall evaluation of CSMP? (See page 7 and Appendix C.)

Summary

In the spring, 1977, questionnaires were sent to 69 third grade CSMP teachers and were completed and returned by 59% of them. Over half these teachers were also interviewed. Some of them had taught CSMP before and were working with students who had studied CSMP before. Other teachers were using CSMP for the first time; sometimes with students new to CSMP, at other times with students who had studied CSMP before. Teachers who returned the questionnaire appeared to be fairly representative of the total group of third grade teachers in the Extended Pilot Trial in terms of experience and overall attitude towards CSMP.

The responses will be summarized according to three areas: Overall Judgments, Student Achievement and Mechanical Aspects.

Overall Judgments

On an open-ended question asking for an overall evaluation of CSMP, 86% of the responses were generally positive towards CSMP, although 2/3 of these expressed reservations of one kind or another.

On an open-ended question on the spiral approach of CSMP, about twice as many responses were positive as were negative.

In comparing CSMP to the previously used mathematics curricula, three times as many responses indicated a higher, as opposed to a lower, level of student enthusiasm, and three times as many responses indicated that the overall quality of CSMP was higher, rather than lower.

The responses to these four questions indicate a definitely favorable attitude towards CSMP on the part of this year's third grade teachers. For each of these questions however it was also true that the responses were less favorable than in previous grade levels, and less favorable than they were from the previous year's third grade teachers. It was also true that new-to-CSMP teachers responded less favorably than did veteran CSMP teachers.

Student Achievement

There are many indications that teachers see a need for more emphasis on basic skills:

In comparing CSMP with previous math curricula, teachers rated CSMP better or worse, in about equal numbers; on student achievement of the usual skills and concepts, and on students' facility in solving word problems.

About 3/4 of the teachers supplemented the program on a regular basis, usually with basic skill practice.

Over half the teachers noted that there were some basic skills that their CSMP students should have had but didn't.

The most frequently mentioned "worst aspect" of CSMP was that there was not enough drill on the basic facts.

Closely related to the basic skills issue is the appropriateness of CSMP for the low ability students. Almost 2/3 of the teachers felt it was less appropriate than their previously used math program, and this was the second most listed "worst aspect" of CSMP.

On the other hand, many teachers noted that CSMP helped children to think and be creative; and five times as many teachers thought CSMP students' ability to do logical reasoning was better, as opposed to worse, than with their previous math program.

Mechanical Aspects

Teachers generally seemed to be able to cope with the program; most followed the schedule and expected to complete it by the end of the year. There were many fewer references to difficulties in managing materials and not knowing what to do than in previous years and grade levels, though most teachers again expressed a need for built-in tests in the materials.

Regarding time requirements, most teachers felt that (1) CSMP would not require more preparation time than usual after a year's experience, (2) more class time was needed for math instruction and that this was a positive thing, and (3) more of the class time was teacher-led and that this also was a positive thing. In each case, a sizable minority (about 25%) thought these were unfavorable aspects of CSMP.

Most teachers felt reasonably well prepared for CSMP after their training (again a sizable minority disagreed) and thought that most teachers would be able to teach it adequately. Meeting informally with other teachers seemed to happen more frequently, and be more useful, than meeting with the coordinator during the course of the year.

Appendix A

Teacher Questionnaire

Name _____

(If your class was new to CSMP and you taught lessons from Part I and Part II of the Upper Primary Grades Program, check this box. ☐

Questionnaire Item - Part I

1. For which of the following strands did you think there were too many lessons in the Guide? Too few lessons?

	Too Many	Too Few	About Right
World of Numbers	☐	☐	☐
Language of Strings	☐	☐	☐
Language of Arrows	☐	☐	☐
Geometry & Measurement	☐	☐	☐
Probability, Statistics & Combinatorics	☐	☐	☐

2. Experiences with specific lessons:

   a) Did your students generally understand the lessons on decimals as outlined in the Guide?

   Yes_____ No_____

   If not, what particular problems did they have?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   b) Do you feel the lessons on "Tam-Tam" would be more appropriate for 4th graders?

   Yes_____ No_____

   c) About how frequently do you have your students do exercises in mental arithmetic? _____

   Comments? _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

d) About how many times have you had your class play the string game? _____

Have you played the version with the "NOT" cards? Yes_____ No_____

If "Yes", about how many times? _____

Comments? _____

_____

_____

e) How well did your students seem to understand the lessons on parallelism (disregarding physical problems in using the translator)?

_____

_____

_____

f) Aside from problems with the marble shakers and/or translators, please list any problems you have had with the manipulatives.

_____

_____

_____

g) Are your students generally able to do the things with the minicomputer prescribed in the lessons?

Yes_____ No_____

Comments? _____

_____

_____

_____

PART II

1. What week of the CSMP schedule were you on, or do you expect to be on, at the end of the school year?

_____

2. Have you followed the schedule fairly closely? _____

or

If not, what changes did you make? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. If you occasionally used supplemental materials (drill sheets, etc.), answer item a).

If you used CSMP in combination with some other math program or text, answer item b).

a) What kinds of supplementary materials did you use? _____

_____

Covering what topics? _____

_____

How often did you use these materials? _____

_____

b) Name of other math program or text? _____

During what part of the school year? _____

Roughly what proportion of time did the class spend on this program as opposed to CSMP?

_____

4. Were there any skills that your students lacked at the beginning of the year that the third grade CSMP curriculum seemed to expect of them?

Are there any skills that your CSMP students don't have now that you think most third graders should have?

5. Do you feel you were fairly well prepared for teaching CSMP after your initial training? (If not please indicate what you thought was lacking.)

6. Do you find that CSMP required more or less time in teacher led work with the whole class than other math programs you have used?

Do you like this aspect of CSMP?

7. When you assign workbooks, do you:

a) Start by giving the one-star workbooks to all students ☐

b) Start by assigning different levels to different students ☐

Do you correct the workbooks

a) with the whole class together? ☐

b) on an individual basis? ☐

About what percent of your students are given

a) the two-star workbooks? _____

b) the three-star workbooks? _____

Do the workbooks tell you enough for you to make evaluations of the students' progress?

Should tests be built into the materials at certain places?

8. Compared to previous mathematics programs you have used, how does CSMP compare on the following items:

a) Time required for daily preparation is

(less) (about the same) (more at first but about the same after a year's experience) (more at first and continues to be after a year's experience)

b) Student interest and involvement with CSMP is

(far less) (a little less) (about the same) (a little more) (far more)

c) Students' overall achievement of the usual math skills and concepts with CSMP is

(far less) (a little less) (about the same) (a little more) (far more)

d) Students' ability to do logical reasoning with CSMP is

(far less) (a little less) (about the same) (a little more) (far more)

e) Students' facility in solving word problems with CSMP is

(far less) (a little less) (about the same) (a little more) (far more)

f) Overall quality of CSMP is

(much lower) (slightly lower) (about the same) (slightly higher) (much higher)

g) The <u>appropriateness</u> of CSMP for low ability students is

(much lower) (slightly lower) (about the same) (slightly higher) (much higher)

h) The amount of time given to math instruction with CSMP is

(greater) (about the same) (less)

(Is this a positive or negative feature of CSMP?_____)

9. What do you think are the best aspects of CSMP?

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. What do you think are the worst aspects of CSMP?

_____

_____

_____

_____

23

11. What is your overall evaluation of CSMP?

12. Does the spiral approach, as exemplified by the different strands, seem to be working for your children?

Appendix B

Responses About Particular Lessons

About how frequently do you have your students do exercises in mental arithmetic? _____

Comments?

Everyday	(34)	*Every other week*	(11)
Several times/week	(26)	*Once/month*	(3)
Once/week	(18)	*Infrequently*	(8)

About how many times have you had your class play the string game? *Never:* (21) *Once:* (18) *Twice:* (18) *3-6 times:* (24) *More than 6 times:* (18)

Have you played the version with the "NOT" cards? Yes (10) No (90)

If "Yes", about how many times? *once:* (2) *twice:* (2) *four times:* (5)

How well did your students seem to understand the lessons on parallelism (disregarding physical problems in using the translator)?

Understood well: (65) *Understood so-so:* (14) *Understood poorly:* (11)

Didn't use: (11)

Are your students generally able to do the things with the minicomputer prescribed in the lessons?

Yes (79) No (21)

Comments? *Problems with backwards plays:* (20)

Did your students generally understand the lessons on decimals as outlined in the Guide?

Yes (56) No (44)

Do you feel the lessons on "Tam-Tam" would be more appropriate for 4th graders?

Yes (68) No (32)

Aside from problems with the marble shakers and/or translators, please list any problems you have had with the manipulatives.

No other problems: (54)

Problems with minicomputer materials: (44)

Didn't use manipulatives: (2)

When you assign workbooks, do you:

a) Start by giving the one-star workbooks to all students ☐ (95)

b) Start by assigning different levels to different students ☐ (5)

Do you correct the workbooks

a) with the whole class together? ☐ (37)

b) on an individual basis? ☐ (47)

Both: (17)

About what percent of your students are given

a) the two-star workbooks? *Majority said "over 50%"*

b) the three-star workbooks? *Majority said "25-33%"*

3.

Appendix C

Responses to Open-Ended Questionnaire Items

For each item, the responses are numbered from 1 to 41, even when the response is a blank. Then each respondent has a given number and retains that number for each item. Response 27 on each question, for example, is from the same teacher. The responses are also grouped according to teacher/class experience (denoted "new" or "veteran").

The items are in the following order:

What do you think are the best aspects of CSMP? (Page 28)

What do you think are the worst aspects of CSMP? (Page 32)

What is your overall evaluation of CSMP? (Page 37)

Does the spiral approach, as exemplified by the different strands, seem to be working for your children? (Page 40)

What do you think are the best aspects of CSMP?

Veteran Teachers, Veteran Classes:

1 - "The children enjoy the math lessons. Does a good job teaching place value. Encourages thinking and problem solving."

2 - "The children like working with translators, rulers and other materials. I think the lessons prepared are more advanced than lessons prepared in regular math books. The children enjoy doing these exercises (which are different)."

3 - 'CSMP lessons teach the studetns to reason more logically. I like the way word problems are introduced and worked out with the children. They are encouraged to be better thinkers. The program has been very good for high level thinking students.

4 - "It teaches children now to think. I found it to be most effective with the above average student."

5 - "Students are better able to do mental math. They enjoy doing worksheet and some workbooks. It included areas of math such as (metric improbability) that other textbooks don't. We enjoy the spiral approach which reinforces."

6 - "The probability strand and the way the program is presented. It involves the students directly and requires them to think rather than learn rules. My children understand place value and regrouping now. They didn't before."

7 - "Logical thinking ability of students."

8 - "The spiral approach to math. The stories that are used with the lessons. The games such as the Submarine Game and the String Game."

9 - --

10 - "To me, there are very few."

11 - "The spiral approach; interesting introductory stories; manipulative materials; workbooks and worksheets."

12 - "Development of math reasoning and logic; mental computation; use of very interesting and motivating materials; providing for intellectual differences - (*, **, *** idea)."

13 - --

14 - "More variety. Reason in head."

15 - "The chance it gives for children ot think - children seem to be more interested - the diversity of workbooks."

16 - "It makes the students think more than other math programs I have used."

New Teachers, Veteran Classes:

17 - "It teaches reasoning and thinking skills; manipulatives make math fun and creative. It is an exciting program; fun to teach - and fun to learn."

18 - "1. CSMP is a fun time for pupils as well as a learning program.
2. There is a wide variety of activities."

19 - "The children who have had CSMP since kindergarten seem to have a very good concept of numbers. Many of them, also, can reason things better than children I've had in the past. They have a good background in mutiplication (basic concept of repeated addition)."

20 - "Place Value - logical reasoning"

21 - "The variety of the lesson. The varied use of problematical solving of problems of all types. The use of many phases of math as a basic program (not good for all students."

22 - "Teaching place value and distributive law of mutiplication."

23 - "Presentation of math as more than numbers and lessons geared to have children discover from self."

24 - "The introduction of concepts that were previously not introduced until 5th or 6th grade - such as decimals - parallelism."

25 - "Timing; each activity is very-well planned; teacher's outline."

26 - "Challenging for tha higher students."

27 - Develops conceptual abilities."

28 - "The approach attracts the children's attention. The options given for solving proglems. It develops confidence in the student by letting them think through a problem doing it their way and yet arriving at the correct answer."

29 - "CSMP excites the children and gives even the poorer student achieve success."

New Teachers, New Students:

30 - --

31 - --

32 - "Arror roads, strings"

33 - "Good for high acheivers but too hard for most of my students."

34 - "World of Numbers; Language of Arrows"

35 - "CSMP is geared for the brighter or average students but too hard for the slow students."

36 - "String Language"

37 - "The pressure of test giving and taking is lifted. In many cases slower students are very motivated. It promotes logical thinking (which they desperately need).

38 - "Higher motivaiton for both students and me, spiral exposure to skills and concepts no penalty for failure to gain mastery upon first exposure, stress on logical solutions to matters highly, pertinent in daily lives of children."

39 - "Spiral approach - I really like it!"

40 - "It gives all students a chance to succeed, at least part of the itme. It lets students work problems even if they don't know their basic +. -, x, - facts by using the minicomputer. It's colorful, varied, and not just drudge."

41 - "It helps the children realize there are a variety of ways to work with math. They don't have to learn all of them. It allows the children to think and be more creative than the previous math programs I have taught."

What do you think are the worst aspects of CSMP?

Veteran Teachers, Veteran Classes:

1 - "No evaluations or test - difficult for the teacher to give a grade on the report card. It's O.K. with me but others need mroe than my judgement for grade. Needs more drill - written into program. I have made up my own."

2 - "The children don't grasp the probability part of math very well."

3 - "There are too many teacher-oriented lessons. All but the very brightest children are lost during these sessions. There is not enough material the children can get their hands on. They like lessons with worksheets. They need practice sheets."

4 - "I feel that it doesn't reach the slow student. During the oral exercises the slow math students will often tune out without you being aware of it."

5 - "The manuals are not so easy to refer to, and tear up easily. Many of the problems are too hard for some of the students, especially when the class is mostly below average in Reading Language, etc., as mine is this year."

6 - "There is not enough drill."

7 - "Not enough drill work - especially multiplication facts."

8 - "Not enough evaluation material."

9 - --

10 - "I think this program requires a <u>good</u> math background, which I have not got. I feel there is too much preparation for <u>day</u> to <u>day</u> teaching."

11 - "The teacher's guide. It should be sequenced according to daily lessons."

12 - "* - lack of evaluative tools; * lack of worksheets to reinforce; lack of students becoming proficient in:
a) writing problems down on paper to solve
b) using and understanding place value, expanded notation
c) subtraction problems, like 9006 because it's introduced at end of year."
<u>-999</u>

13 - --

14 - "Not enough drill on facts. Too much repeat of 1st part of year assignment. Not enough printed material to read. Too large numbers."

15 - "It is too difficult for the slow learner - they cannot change from one strand to another but need more concentration on a given strand - (too confusing). If the easy method of subtraction is used - should be introduced in 2nd grade - more metric needed - more rote learning or practice of multiplication and division tables. Need review workbooks in 3rd grade. Need more built in evaluation."

16 - "(1) Materials don't hold up; (2) too many complicated processes in teaching simple skills; (3) even though the minicomputer is concrete in a way it is abstract too. Many things are too abstract."

New Teachers, Veteran Classes:

17 "It's organization and too many materials to keep track of; lack of objectives (being stated at each lesson). Need more problem-solving situations and measurement activities. Also need a local coordinator well trained in the program and math."

18 - "Provisions for pupils entering late in the year with no prior experience with CSMP."

19 - "The children do not have time to master basic addition, subtraction or multiplication facts. Many of the workbooks and story-workbooks the children had difficulty doing on their own so we did them in groups. There seems to be too much large group work with this program. It is difficult to help children who are having difficulty . . . especially when you are working with a large group. There are no lessons devoted to telling time and very little to measurement. I don't feel that I like the spiral approach to teaching math...I would prefer to devote a couple of lessons, consecutively, to one concept as opposed to picking things up weeks later. We could have review lessons or new continued lessons on concepts monthly or every two months after having a few days as a basic lesson."

20 - "Subtraction; multiplication; Tam-Tam; Marbles - Trans."

21 - "(1) The varied length of time of lesson (short 20 min.-long 60 min.) (2) The de-emphasis of basic skills and facts. (3) Assumption of skill learned when teaching."

22 - "Spiral aspect - I feel it is better for third graders to stay with one particular objective."

23 - "Too much attention to probability and geometry. Too little emphasis on basic skills (ex., subtraction with borrowing at the 3rd grade level)."

24 - "For my low students - some lessons were too long and too hard."

25 - "At first I thought it couldn't be done, to teach a whole class in Math. But the way the lessons are scheduled in CEMREL I had no problems."

26 - "Too abstract for the lower children - don't know the facts."

27 - "Not enough drill and practice. Do not like spiral approach. Too much time spent recalling previous lessons."

28 - "The slow learner is not able to change from strand to strand. More time is needed to master a concept. Definitely some rote learning should be scheduled in for learning of facts. They will always be tested in traditional math and they need more practice in regrouping and carrying.

There is no way to report to parents. There needs to be an evaluation for the teacher to be able to discuss with the parents.

It is a very difficult problem for chidlren who have emotional problems. They are easily distracted and get lost with verbal instruction in a group situation."

29 - "Do not include enough drill and practice; do not include practical daily use of everyday math (time, measuring): do not like spiral approach."

New Teachers, New Classes:

30 - "CSMP expected too much from the students as far as assuming that they knew the skill or had a background."

31 - --

32 - "minicomputer"

33 - "Confusing to most students. Too much mental arithmetic."

34 - "Probability, Statistics and Combinatorics; some parts of Geometry and Measurement."

35 - "Most students cannot do mental arithmetic. Some just gave up and didn't try."

36 - "Not enough drills"

37 - "Too much reading and preparation for some of the lessons. There isn't enough work with story problems."

38 - "?"

39 - "Would like to see teaching objectives. There have been lessons where I did not know or really see the objective involved."

40 - "I found that my brightest students did not want to bother with the minicomputer, and then would make many mistakes. The long probability - gathering tables were boring at times; parents are really confused by what's going on...(they didn't bother to come to explain programs).

41 - "The need to correct a one star workbook or paper before going on to the two star workbook or paper makes it impossible for me to help the slow children like I think they should b helped. Having other children correct the workbooks does not work either for several reasons. First they don't get the practice they should have in 2 or 3 star booklets if they correct other chidlrens' workbooks. Also they cannot find the correct answer by themselves if they have seen it."

What is your overall evaluation of CSMP?

Veteran Teachers, Veteran Classes:

12 - "It's a challenging, stimulating math program for children. I'd like to see some evaluative tools for the teacher to evaluate the student and for the student to see what he has accomplished and learned. I'd also like more worksheets to reinforce material presented in lesson. I feel uncertain of what each student knows. However, I know I wouldn't be satisfied teaching a traditional math program and the standardized tests show the children to be on grade level or above."

13 - I am very pleased with the CSMP program. However, it is harder for the real slow child, but over the years I have found that most math is harder. I believe, overall my group of students are better than they were or would be in a conventional form math book.

14 - "I'd like it better than a text. The pluses outweigh the minuses."

16 - "I think parts of it are good and parts of it are bad just like most programs I have used. On top of all the time it requries to teach and get ready for daily lessons, there are too many questionnaires and papers to fill out."

Veteran Teachers, New Classes:

18 - "CSMP has been quite rewarding. Because of having the wrong materials many times it became a difficult task trying to keep enough materials feady for use."

New Teacher, New Classes:

30 - "CSMP might be a good supplementary program. It should be taught to pupils that already have the basics and have time or can spare the time to work with it."

31 - "As you can see I did not like the CSMP as a whole - there were a few good points that tied in with my text book. Had my students had this in the 1st and 2nd grades and I had been better instructed - it might have worked out better - But it was like taking Spanish - trying to speak and write it before the basic lessons were taught -

All of the 2nd part of the second grade and third the materials had to be Xerox copied for us and the arrows in color were not put in. The aide didn't know if they were suppose to be in or not. Also at St. John's I had no other teacher to discuss my problems with - as in Public School there was usually one teacher that had a little training in CSMP."

32 - "It is great after the basic facts have been learned."

33 - "It was above most of the students. They came out of second grade not knowing the addition and subtraction facts. Too much mental arithmetic for those who had not learned the skills (addition and subtraction). Since these students had not had CSMP they needed more time in a regular program before CSMP was introduced. Trying to cram 2nd and 3rd grade materials all in one year was too much."

34 - "I like the program, with a few exceptions. I thought the students liked it and enjoyed it because most of the time I'd already have the worksheets, etc. that I needed for each lesson."

35 - "Too much mental arithmetic for most students that had not mastered the addition and subtraction facts or other skills."

36 - "For fast students fine. Slow they need more individual help."

37 - "Being my first year in the program, I like the change and way the material is introduced. However, these are some sections where more drill is needed, and others where there are too many lessons. There are no areas on time or calendar. In these cases we needed ot use supplementary materials. I think these areas are a necessary part of this grade level."

38 - "Excellent"

39 - "I really liked the idea of the spiral approach and the constant use of mental math (logic). However, on my part (the first year I've used it) it was very time consuming."

40 - "I was pleased with the overall accomplishment of my class this year, especially the lower end. I found it itneresting to teach, and the calss enjoyed it. I am curious to see whether the interest is sustained next year with a veteran class because my own class became more lethargic as the months rolled on, complaining if they had to use teh minicomputer, etc. At first it was all enthusiasm. Will next year's class start off lukewarm? As I talked to the first and second grade teachers, their classes seemed to react the same way the last 2-3 month of school."

41 - "I am waiting to make a true evaluation during the next school year. This was my first year with the program. I think my class this year added and subtracted more slowly than any class I have ever had. However, I didn't use flash cards for review of the facts like I did other eyars. I like the variety of activities and the children like the workbooks. My biggest concern is the student or students who are slow in math. I don't think they get as much help as they need when the class is taught all together."

Does the spiral approach, as exemplified by the different strands, seem to be working for your children?

Veteran Teachers, Veteran Classes:

12 - "For the most part, yes. It doesn't bore the class by staying on one topic for a long while. However, at times, I feel some reinforcement or following-up of a particular lesson would be beneficial."

13 - "Yes, this is the part I like best! So many times the next time around they do better."

14 - "Yes. Sometimes, though, I wish I could go back right then."

16 - "Yes"

Veteran Teachers, New Classes:

18 - "Yes"

New Teachers, New Classes:

30 - "No"

31 - --

32 - "It did not follow the plan well enough to tell."

33 - "No. Only for a small percentage."

34 - "In most cases it did."

35 - "For some students but not all."

36 - "Not too good, but hopeful for a better year next year. Our program was an entry program and next year we will have from K-3."

37 - "Yes. It seems to give them more opportunity to grasp the concepts. There is not that pressure to succeed the first time."

(Thank you for asking for our opinions. Those that work with the program daily know how practical it is more than anyone It shows that you are interested in keeping the good standards of your program.)

38 - "Superbly"

39 - "Yes"

40 - "Yes, it really does. What seemed insurmountable at first, seems to fall into place the second and third time around."

41 - "For half the students I think it is working. For one-fourth the class it works with some of the lessons and not others. The last one-fourth need an explanation or good review from week to week."

Appendix D

Responses to Questions Unique to the Interview

A1. How do you feel today's lesson went? (See page 44)

A2. Which lesson is it on the schedule? (See page 45)

A4. Would you like to see the schedule revised? How so? (See page 46)

B2. Do you periodically get together with your coordinator or with other CSMP teachers during the year? Is this helpful? (See page 48)

B3. Do you think most third grade teachers could do an adequate job of teaching CSMP? (See page 49)

F2. How much time do you usually give them for each workbook series or for each story book? (See page 51)

H1. Have your perceptions of CSMP changed since the beginning of the year? (See page 52)

A1. How do you feel today's lesson went?

O.K.

Alright - but I'm not sure I did it as intended. We went over all the possibilities on the 1st page so the other pages were too easy for students.

Only had about 5 students who understand division, so had to spend more time on that lesson.

Very well (workbook lesson - A Short Story About 2 Friends)

Teacher hasn't taught CSMP for "awhile". Pretty good, - it was something we'd skipped over and gone back to.

It was an old 2nd grade game about number lines. It's good for learning number order.

Went fairly well. This was 2nd time around and they were familiar with what was going on.

Went pretty well...some kids didn't get it...but they're the ones who never do.

Went well because it was a scheduled continuation of a lesson started last week. Most of the problems were ironed out before.

As usual, the group lesson went well. The individual work did not go so smoothly. This happens more with CSMP because there's no inbetween: like small groups.

A2. Which lesson is it on the schedule?

Week 22 (4 Teachers)

Week 23

Week 24 (4)

Week 25 (2)

Week 26

Week 27

Week 28

Week 29 (4)

Week 30

Week 31 (2)

Week 32 (2)

Week 35

A4. Would you like to see the schedule revised? How so?

Maybe so - too much probability

No - but some days there isn't enough time for a lesson.

Would like to see all lessons the same length.

It's better than it was last year.

No.

Some of the lessons need 2 lessons close together (one day after the next).

No

Yes - had trouble following schedule and finding the right pages.

Some of the lessons were too long. Couldn't find one of the lessons.

Yes - would like to see list of materials needed writeen on schedule and would like book to follow day-by-day schedule.

No

No

Not sure - sometimes couldn't find things in the manual.

No

Would like to see 2 schedules: one the way it now is and one showing all lessons in each strand grouped together. Also would like separate scheduled for different-ability groups.

No - I like it

No - I like it much better than last year's

No

Likes this year's better than last's. Would like to see objectives for lessons (especially with probability).

No - she's used to it the way it's arranged.

She's used to less jumping around from one subject to another. Feels that all lessons on multiplication should be together, etc.

Other teacher dealt with schedule for her.

A4. (continued)

No need for free days.

Somewhat. Stay with a unit for longer than one day - not use the spiral approach.

Yes - too much; like 2 lessons on Telephone Game instead of 3. - Too much wasted time.

Yes - too much of the non-traditional; not enough traditional.

Yes - get subtraction in earlier.

Yes and no - Put subtraction earlier; do +, -, x, -, instead of +, x, -, -. Likes spiral approach, but feels the "circle" should be somewhat smaller.

Yes - I'd delete some lessons. Write down objectives for each lesson. Spiral approach frustrating at times.

B2. Do you periodically get together with your coordinator or with other CSMP teachers during the year? Is this helpful?

We were trying to meet after school each Friday to get ready for the next week, but we were too tired.

Coordinator has come a couple of times. Says she doesn't have time to talk with other CSMP teacher.

No

Not with coordinator, but with other teacher. Coordinator taught one lesson. Gets together with other CSMP teachers when she has problems - very helpful.

Talks with 2nd grade teachers - they're helpful. Also finds students can be helpful.

Coordinator taught 2 lessons. Gets together with other CSMP teachers when confused - It's helpful.

Has met with coordinator about 3 times this year. He's understanding, but teacher feels reluctant to mention problems. Other teacher is not very helpful (different ways of teaching) but ARCH person helps sometimes.

Coordinator is seldom around. She gets together with other CSMP teachers, but this is helpful only form a psychological point of view.

No

Doesn't really know coordinator - saw him once. Confers very closely - everyday - with other teacher. It's helpful.

Not with coordinator, but helps other teacher everyday.

Would have been more helpful more frequently - like 1 or 2 times/month rather than 2 or 3 times/year. Does get together with other 2 3rd grade CSMP teachers - it's helpful.

Got together with coordinator 4 or 5 times this year (including 2 days at beginning) helpful. Also, gets together very often informally with other teachers 2 or 3 times/week. Very helpful.

Talks with other CSMP teachers in building a bit (K-2). Sees coordinator since both are on Math Council; but would have been nice to have meetings with her during year. Coordinator very helpful on her one class visit.

With coordinator - very infrequently (2 or 3 times/year) Not too helpful. Frequently with other 3rd grade CSMP teacher.

The few district wide meetings with coordinator were helpful. Very helpful to work with other 3rd grade CSMP teacher.

A few meetings with coordinator. Got together 10 times with others in building. Helpful.

B3. Do you think most third grade teachers could do an adequate job of teaching CSMP?

Yes, but you've got to do a little preparing

Yes I think so

Well, I had problems but I guess most people could do it.

Oh yes

Sure - if they study the lesson. You have to put in time

Yes

I think so (but not sure) - Depends on background

Yes - Most of us need in-depth training. But if you will sit down with that manual for a couple of days you can do it.

No - you really need a specialist teacher

Yes

Yes - an adequate job

Yes - thought the training was very thorough

Yes

Feels you need to go over each lesson by itself for entire year

It's adequate, but...

Well, I had to do a lot of work on my own.

Yes

Yes

Yes

No

Yes - as long as they don't miss any days

Yes

Yes, probably. It's been hard for me this year but then the 2nd time through is much easier.

Yes, I think so. Might even be good for teachers who normally don't like teaching math.

B3. (continued)

Yes, if they had more training and more build-up of interest.

Given a little more adequate training, the typical 3rd grade teacher can handle CSMP - even the 1st time through.

If teacher is receptive to a new program (e.g. not already turned off by a previous new math program) and has some help (e.g. teacher's aid), then, yes.

I think so. Manual is very specific.

F2. How much time do you usually give them for each workbook series or for each story book?

30-40 minutes a period; and 2 or 3 days for each.

2 days when it's an easy one. On harder ones, might spend 3 or 4 days and in between she'll do the lesson again and review what they did before.

I let them work independently.

If they don't finish one day, they do it the next.

2 lessons - but it depends on the workbook - 1 or 2 class sessions

Takes the whole hour

3 lessons (2 in a row and the 3rd lesson one week later).

One lesson

2-3 periods

Workbook days are longer days. Sometimes they go back after and see if they can do 2**'s.

2 class periods if needed.

Usually 2 lesson periods.

Until they're through - or they might finish them at home. Usually 1 day per week.

It depends - however many Fridays it takes them

As scheduled

However long they need - usually less than is scheduled.

As scheduled.

As schedueld, except towards end of year has only given 2 lessons to a series that calls for 3.

As scheduled up to March, when times have been shortened.

As scheduled.

H1. Have your perceptions of CSMP changed since the beginning of the year?

I feel more secure now and enjoy it. I didn't the first year - I wasn't sure they'd be prepared in basic skills. Also, I really stumbled around at first and didn't feel prepared.

Very negative at first, but I like it now, especially after we got through the first year.

When I started I was scared to death. Now I can see where we're going. I was afraid this first group would have troubles when they got to fourth grade, but their test scores have been fine.

No - I like it fine.

I was very insecure although I loved it from the moment I went to the first session here. And after teaching it I love it even more.

I feel happier with it now.

Not really.

I still go along with it. I was scared at first, especially the M.C. I'm a lot more confident.

I don't enjoy it as much as I did in the beginning. The children seemed more interested and it was more interesting to teach the second grade than it is the third. I think there are more teacher led lessons in the 3rd grade.

Well, I guess (but couldn't specify how)

No (But had her doubts about doing it the same way next year given the same kind of class. She would probably mix in more traditional math.)

No

Yes (Likes it better now. At first she was worried about disinterested students).

Yes (Was very leery at first, didn't feel qualified. - But likes it now).

Yes - the fact that there were fewer materials this year was a good sign. Last year teachers went "berserk" trying to categorize the materials to be used.

Yes - for the better.

Yes - happy with it in first and second grade but not this year.

Yes - definitely. (Initially thought she didn't want to teach it based on things she'd heard, but now she enjoys it.)

Yes (She's become disappointed and doesn't think it's a program for all children.)

H1. (continued)

Yes - loved it in 1st grade, disenchanted with 2nd grade, a bit happier with 3rd (but with some suggestions for changes).

I felt confined by the set dialogue in the guide at first - probably be much easier next year.

Yes - fluctuated. I feel stronger for the program now than 3 or 4 month ago, but with reservation.

Some changes for good, some for bad.

Yes - less happy with it now. Looking forward to giving it a better try next year.

Yes - Was displeased with program from previous eyar, so saw CSMP as a welcome change. But too much on probability. CSMP went too far in other direction.

No change- hoping next year will go better. I was enthusiastic about it to begin with and had heard good things from second grade teachers. But it didn't go as smoothly as I'd hoped.